

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/531,319	06/21/2005	Saburo Matsuoka	2005_0628A	1352
	7590 08/23/200 I, LIND & PONACK,	EXAMINER .		
2033 K STREET N. W.			YEE, DEBORAH	
SUITE 800 WASHINGTO	N, DC 20006-1021		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1742	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			08/23/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)			
	10/531,319	MATSUOKA ET AL.			
Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit			
	Deborah Yee	1742			
The MAILING DATE of this communication app	ears on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence address			
Period for Reply	(10.057.70.5\\D)D5 - 140\\T\\				
A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DA - Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period v - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be time will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the cause the application to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this communication. D (35 U.S.C. § 133).			
Status					
1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on					
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	action is non-final.				
3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is					
closed in accordance with the practice under E	x parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11, 45	53 O.G. 213.			
Disposition of Claims					
4)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are pending in the application.					
4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw	vn from consideration.				
5) Claim(s) is/are allowed.					
6)⊠ Claim(s) <u>1-9</u> is/are rejected.					
7) Claim(s) is/are objected to.	,				
8) Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or	r election requirement.				
Application Papers					
9) The specification is objected to by the Examine	r				
10)⊠ The drawing(s) filed on 13 April 2005 is/are: a)		by the Examiner.			
Applicant may not request that any objection to the	• • • •	•			
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correct	ion is required if the drawing(s) is ob	jected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).			
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Ex	aminer. Note the attached Office	Action or form PTO-152.			
Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119		•			
12)⊠ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign a)⊠ All b)□ Some * c)□ None of:	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a))-(d) or (f).			
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.					
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No					
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage					
application from the International Bureau	, ,,,				
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.					
Attachment(s)					
1) Motice of References Cited (PTO-892) Discrete Discrete States (PTO-948) Discrete States (PTO-948)	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da				
Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>4-13-05</u> .	5) Notice of Informal P 6) Other:				

Application/Control Number: 10/531,319 Page 2

Art Unit: 1742

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1 to 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over the English abstract of Korean patent 2002-008854.
- 3. The English abstract discloses a steel alloy having a nitride layer, wherein the steel has a ferrite grain structure having an average grain size of less than 20 µm (overlaps claimed range of 3 µm) and the nitride layer is formed on a surface of the steel. Moreover prior art steel has a composition containing C, Mn, P, and at least one of Mn, Cr, Mo, Ti, Nb, V and P in wt% ranges that overlap those recited by the one or more of the recited dependent claims. Note that the overlap in range limitations establishes a prima facie case of obviousness since it would be obvious for one skilled in the art to select the claimed range limitations over the broader disclosure of the prior art because the prior art teaches similar properties of high strength and high toughness, see MPEP 2144.06.

Application/Control Number: 10/531,319

Art Unit: 1742

4. Claims 1 to 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese patent 10-306343.

Page 3

- 5. The English abstract discloses a steel alloy having a nitride layer, wherein the steel has a ferrite grain structure having an average grain size of less than 40 μm (overlaps claimed range of 3 μm) and the nitride layer is formed on a surface of the steel. Moreover prior art steel has a composition containing C, Mn, P, and at least one of Mn, Cr, Mo, Ti, Nb, V and P in wt% ranges that overlap those recited by the one or more of the recited dependent claims. Note that the overlap in range limitations establishes a prima facie case of obviousness since it would be obvious for one skilled in the art to select the claimed range limitations over the broader disclosure of the prior art because the prior art teaches similar properties of high strength, hardenability and high toughness, see MPEP 2144.06.
- 6. Claims 1 to 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Japanese patent 9-291339.
- 7. The English abstract discloses a steel alloy having a nitride layer, wherein the steel has a ferrite grain structure having an ultra-fine grain size number of No. 5 or above (overlaps claimed range of 3 µm) and the nitride layer is formed on a surface of the steel. Moreover prior art steel has a composition containing C, Mn, P, and at least one of Mn, Cr, Mo, Ti, Nb, V and P in wt% ranges that overlap those recited by the one or more of the recited dependent claims. Note that the overlap in range limitations establishes a prima facie case of obviousness since it would be obvious for one skilled in the art to select the claimed range limitations over the broader disclosure of the prior

Art Unit: 1742

art because the prior art teaches similar properties of high fatigue strength and high toughness, see MPEP 2144.06.

Specification

8. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: Page 7, second to last line, "dine", should be –fine---.

Appropriate correction is required.

Information Disclosure Statement

9. The information disclosure statement filed 4-13-05 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(2), which requires a legible copy of each cited foreign patent document; each non-patent literature publication or that portion which caused it to be listed; and all other information or that portion which caused it to be listed. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Deborah Yee whose telephone number is 571-27211253. The examiner can normally be reached on monday-friday 6:00am-2:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Roy King can be reached on 571-272-1244. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 1742

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Deborah Yee

Primary Examiner Art Unit 1742

dy